INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses	Page
Pu-Yi, Henry (resumed)	4144
Cross by Major Blakeney (continued) " Captain Kleiman	4144 4184

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. Def. No. No.	Description	Ident.	Evidence
279	Preface of Book "Twilight of Life in the Forbidden City" by Sir Reginald Johnston	4180	

1	Thursday, 22 August, 1946
2	
3	
4	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
5	FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal
6	War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan
7	zonjo, oupun
8	The Tribunal met numeuant to adjournment
9	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,
10	at 0930.
11	
12	
13	Appearances:
14	For the Tribunal, same as before.
	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
15	For the Defense Section, same as before.
16	
17	
18	
19	(English to Japanese, Japanese to
20	English, English to Chinese, and Chinese to
21	English interpretation was made by the
22	Language Section, IMTFE.)
23	Language December, Line 1977
24	
25	

MARSHAI

A Military Tribuna

THE PRI

THE PRI

Except OKAWA, Ma

Perpresented by

further certific

officer certify:

SHIRATORI and His

recorded and file

Major I

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except OKAWA, MATSUI, HIRANUMA, and SHIRATORI who are represented by their respective counsel. I have two further certificates by the Sugamo Prison's medical officer certifying to the continued illness of SHIRATORI and HIRANUMA. These certificates will be recorded and filed.

Major Blakeney.

24

25

A

Yes.

HENRY PU-YI, called as a witness on behalf 1 of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testi-2 fied as follows: 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 4 BY MAJOR BLAKENEY: 5 Q You were telling us at yesterday's recess 6 7 where you have been since the end of the war. Will 8 you please continue? 9 Yes. When the Russian air force arrived I 10 was taken to Po-Li. With me were the various minis-11 ters -- Chinese ministers also were there. We were 12 housed in a villa at outskirts of Po-Li until the 13 present. 14 Q Where is Po-Li? Is that in Siberia? 15 It is Khabarovsk. 16 Did you go there voluntarily from Manchuria? 17 As we were stopped by the Soviet air force 18 we were taken up there. 19 During the time that you have been in Khaba-20 rovsk have you been a prisoner? 21 We were detained there but we were given 22 freedom to go out and walk about at the nearby river.

How did you come to Tokyo?

When you went out were you under armed guard?

1	A I was asked to come over by the prosecution
2	to be a witness in the trial.
3	Q Did you come to Tokyo under guard?
4	A Yes.
5	Q Is it your expectation that you will be
6	tried as a war criminal by any nation?
7	MR. KEENAN: If the Court please, prosecution
8	objects to that question as being irrelevant to any
9	of the issues in this case, and being entirely out-
0	side the scope of the cross-examination.
1	THE PRESIDENT: It is also tantamount to
2	asking him to incriminate himself. The objection is
3	sustained.
4	Q Do you know that the Chinese Government pro-
5	poses to try you as a criminal for collaboration with
6	Japan?
7	MR. KEENAN: If the Tribunal please, the
8	prosecution objects to that question as being highly
9	improper. Already omniscience has been a scribed to
0	this witness. Now the defense counsel purports to
1	tell him what the Chinese Government is going to do.
2	In any event it is improper, irrelevant to any of the
13	issues, and does not belong before this Tribunal.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: May I be heard on the

24 25

question?

THE PRESIDENT: You may be heard, Major.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: I should like to submit to the Tribunal that we have here a witness who has willingly testified that in the past on numerous occasions under threat of force he has distorted the truth. And it does seem to me that nothing can better assist the Tribunal in deciding the credibility of his testimony than to know his present status and his frame of mind regarding it. We raise the same question of duress the universal validity of which was conceded yesterday by Mr. Chief Prosecutor.

THE PRESIDENT: The universal validity of that was conceded. In my own country there is an exception in favor of a married woman acting under the compulsion of her husband. However, that is another question; but I could not allow that statement of yours to pass unchallenged. We are all against you, or the majority at least of the Court is against you on that particular form of the question you put to the witness. We sustain the objection. But you are at liberty to put questions to the witness to ascertain whether his evidence is the result of any threat or promise.

Q Mr. Witness, has anything which you have testified to in this trial been the result of any threats made to you, or any promises?

٠,

11

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A No threats or promises were made to me whatsoever. I told the truth, the truth I know of.

Q You made the statement a day or so ago that
General UMEZU told General YOSHIOKA not to permit you
to visit your ancestral tombs. Were you present
when General UMEZU gave General YOSHIOKA those instructions?

A At that time YOSHIOKA told me that he received orders from UMEZU.

Q When was that?

A That was the time when I was inspecting -- I was on an inspection tour in Mukden. As my ancestral tomb was then nearby in Mukden, so I proposed to visit that place, and YOSHIOKA told me that according to the order of General UMEZU he was not allowed to go to see the tomb -- I was not allowed to go to see the tomb, on the reason that the Manchurian Emperor should not go to visit his own ancestral tomb.

Q What year was this?

A That was during the regime of General UMEZU.

I cannot recall the exact year.

- Q How many times did you visit Mukden?
- A I think it is twice.
 - Q Can you give us the date of either visit?
- A To tell you the truth, I cannot recall all the

1	dates. If you care to look into the Manchukuo Yearbook
2	you will readily find all these dates mentioned therein
3	Q Was this on the occasion of your first visit
4	to Mukden, or your second?
5	A The second visit. The first visit I paid at
6	the Fengtien was under the regime of General UEDA.
7	Q What years was General UEDA in Manchuria?
8	A You can look into the Manchukuo Yearbook to
9	find these dates.
10	Q What is your best recollection of the years
11	that General UEDA was in Manchuria?
12	A He was in Manchuria prior to the installation
13	of General UMEZU.
14	Q Can you give us any idea of how many years
15	General UEDA was in Manchuria?
16	A I have prepared a note bearing all the dates
17	of the arrival of the different Kwantung Army officers.
18	With permission of the Tribunal I would refer to them.
19	Q I am asking you to refer to your memory and
20	tell us approximately how many years General UEDA was
21	in Manchuria.
22	A A few years. But exactly how many years I
23	cannot tell.

cannot tell.

G	1	Q When was General UMEZU in Manchuria?
r	2	A He was there after General UEDA.
e	3	Q Can you tell us approximately what years
b	4	he was there?
r	5	A I cannot answer you without the accurate
&	6	knowledge of the thing.
В	7	(To the President) May I request the Tri-
a	8	bunal's permission to allow me to refer to the notes
r t o	9	I have?
n	10	THE FRESIDENT: If it is necessary, witness,
	11	you may refer to your notes if those notes were made
	12	at the time when the events they record took place.
	13	THE WITNESS: These notes was prepared
	14	by me when I was in Manchuria. It was a very brief
	15	one.
	16	THE PRESIDENT: Were they made at the time
	17	the events which they record took place?
	18	THE WITNESS: These notes were jot down by
	19	me from time to time when I was in Manchuria. It was
	20	not exactly put down or recorded right after the
	21	event happened.
	22	THE PRESIDENT: It is sufficient if they
	23	were made shortly after the events.
	24	THE WITNESS: About the dates of the ar-

rival of these commanding officers, I took them down

as soon as they arrived; and some of them I put down only after I was informed by the Chairman of the 2 Privy Council. 3 THE PRESIDENT: How long after were you 4 informed by the Chairman of the Privy Council? Did you know of your own knowledge? 6 THE WITNESS: They told me right after 7 the event. 8 THE PRESIDENT: You may use those notes 9 if necessary to refresh your memory. 10 Are these the same notes that you used in 11 giving your testimony in chief? 12 A Yes. 13 14 Did you not testify in your testimony in chief that those notes were made a few days ago? 15 16 About the dates of the arrival of these commanding officers, I had kept a separate paper 17 18 which was -- the contents of which was took down 19 by me when the arrival took place. 20 Q I just asked you whether the notes that you 21 now propose to use are the same notes that you used 22 in giving your testimony in chief, and you said 23 "yes." I have asked you whether you did not testify

that those notes were made a few days ago. Are these

the same notes or are they different notes?

24

MR. KEENAN: If the Court please, the prosecution objects to that question as being unfair to the state of the record. It is apparent that this witness referred to his notes at different times during his testimony. Some times he was permitted to and other times not. At one time the President asked him if the particular paper he was looking at was made at the time the event occurred. Now, having answered to that particular paper; it was not made at the time of the event, able counsel for defense groups them all together and could very well leave this witness in a state of confusion.

There is another ground of objection: If
the purpose of this testimony is to bring out evidence,
it is obvious that these facts are adducible as
matters of record; and, therefore, not having testified as to the time that these people were there,
it is beyond the scope of the cross-examination.

If the purpose is to test the memory of this witness, if there is anything apparent in this case with reference to dates, this witness freely admits that his memory is defective. If that be an offense, it must be recognized and be conceded by the prosecution as so being.

THE PRESIDENT: One of my colleagues makes 1 the valuable suggestion, if I may say so, that we 2 might inspect the notes to see whether they are 3 recent notes or not. 4 Has he the notes with him? He must have, 5 6 I take it. We want to see all his notes. 7 THE WITNESS: There is one point I have to 8 make it clear. The original paper was written in pencil. As it was not so clear, and it was hazy, 10 so I had to rewritten it, and rewrite it with a 11 fountain pen. 12 THE PRESIDENT: Have you the original notes 13 which you say you made in Manchuria? 14 THE WITNESS: No, it is not here. 15 THE PRESIDENT: When did you rewrite them 16 in ink? 17 THE WITNESS: I wrote it in Tokyo. 18 THE PRESIDENT: Well, you must have had the 19 original notes in Tokyo. 20 THE WITNESS: Yes. 21 THE PRESIDENT: Can you produce them now? 22 THE WITNESS: I didn't bring it along with 23 me right now because last time the Tribunal refused 24 to let me read into it. I may produce it later on. 25 THE PRESIDENT: If you have them in Tokyo,

you must produce them. 1 The Tribunal has not yet refused to allow 2 3 you to use original notes made in Manchuria. MR. KEENAN: If the Court please, may I 4 5 bring some pertinent information to this Tribunal? 6 It has to do with the manner of the presentation 7 of testimony from non-English speaking witnesses. 8 THE PRESIDENT: What he said is as clear 9 as day. He said he has the original notes in Tokyo. 10 Let him produce them. 11 MR. KEENAN: I think a careful scrutiny 12 of the record may show it is the President of the 13 Court that used the word "original," and it is not 14 the witness. I would like to explain the circum-15 stances if permitted. 16 THE PRESIDENT: He said he had in Tokyo the 17 notes which he made in pencil at the time of the 18 events. They would be original notes.

MR. KEENAN: Will the Court permit me to briefly state the circumstances with reference to the evidence as it was prepared for presentation in

THE PRESIDENT: A vital point has arisen. Let us dispose of that first.

MR. KEENAN: I state to this Court with

19

20

21

22

this unique trial?

23

24

the knowledge that I possess that so doing would be grossly unfair to the circumstances and to this witness. But, if I am not permitted to state the circumstances of the preparation of this testimony, I shall, of course, abide by the ruling of this Tribunal. I would like to state it. I think it is very pertinent.

THE PRESIDENT: You may state whatever you think fits, subject to correction later, Mr. Chief Prosecutor, but do produce those notes in pencil. They are in Tokyo, and it has not been said they are mislaid.

MR. KEENAN: I wish to state briefly that, as the Court knows, the manner of presentation of testimony of non-English speaking witnesses, I assume excepting those of college level with a certain fluency in English, was permitted by this Court to be presented by affidavits that were prepared with the witness available to subject himself to cross-examination if present. In accordance with that, the prosecution caused this witness to be informed that that was the method of presentation of testimony. And, in the early part of June, this testimony was assembled, or, at least, the preparation of it began. A lengthy affidavit was prepared for the purpose of

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

being submitted to this Court in accordance with that procedure. All that occurred many weeks before this witness left Soviet Russia.

Now, many of the notes and the data that he possessed were used in the preparation of that document, and other notes undoubtedly, a summation of them, were made checking from original notes in accordance with the procedure of preparing that document; so that this witness was informed that, when that document had been prepared with careful scrutiny, and in consultation with his notes, that, when he came here to testify, he would be permitted to use a summation to check with the figures and to check with whatever dates, having expressed great difficulty because of the different manner in which time is figured, which we will advert to in reference to this spurious document offered by the defense yesterday. So that, when a witness appears on the stand after such preparation and after much of that data has been reduced to writing and finally presented in court, and having been advised that that would be his testimony in chief, it is a far different situation than a witness appearing in the courts of the United States or Australia in the ordinary procedure prevailing in the ordinary law court.

21

22

23

24

I state to this Court my earnest belief
that circumstances of that nature might very well
cause confusion as to when records were made, and
when they were transcribed from one memorandum made
to a short summation on a short piece of paper for
dates; and that would mean much to distinguished,
learned jurists with trained minds, and some members
of the bar, but would not mean so much as the exact
language as used on the stand, as "When did you
make the memorandum?"

I have not read the notes. They are in the Chinese language, and I do not have proficiency enough to understand them. The inspection of them would mean little to me. With great respect to the Court and appreciation for its patience, I would suggest, in the interest of fairness, that this witness, before adjournment, be briefly but carefully interrogated as to whether he claims that these precise notes which he has in his possession were notes that were made at the time of the particular event or whether they were transcribed from other notes that were so made, as such a state of confusion could readily occur and destroy the credibility of George Washington himself.

5

8

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

THE PRESIDENT: We have still to hear a reason why the penciled notes made in Manchuria are not produced to us.

MR. KEENAN: Was that last a question to the counsel that the Court asked?

THE PRESIDENT: It is an observation, and I hope that you will act on it, that you will combat it, or that you will produce the notes.

MR. KEENAN: We will make every effort to produce it at the earliest convenient hour after the recess.

THE PRESIDENT: I think, Major Blakeney, we are all satisfied that you have tested this witness's memory quite sufficiently.

BY MAJOR BLAKENEY (Continuing):

Q You say that it was by order of General UMEZU that you visited Japan?

A Yes. That was what was told me by General YOSHIOKA.

Q And when did you visit Japan?

THE PRESIDENT: Major, are you really testing memory still, or are you trying to elicit information?

23 MAJOR BLAKENEY: I am not doing either at the
24 moment, sir. I am trying to counteract the effects of
25 the testimony which he gave against my individual client,

General UMEZU.
A It was in 1940.
Q Did you make more than one visit to Japan?
A Twice.
Q Did you make the other one at the order of
General UMEZU?
A That was the time when I came back to pay a
courtesy call to Prince CHICHIBU.
Q Can you tell us when that visit was?
A That was when the defendant, General MINAMI,
was the Commanding General of the Japanese Kwantung
Army.
Q Who accompanied you to Japan in 1940?
A You mean 1940, it was General YOSHIOKA who
came along with me.
Q Was he with you at all times during that
visit?
A Yes.
Q How often did you talk with General UMEZU
during the time he was in Manchuria?
A Yes; very often.
Q Does that mean once a week?
A Approximately three times a month.
Q Where did those conversations occur?
A He always came to where I lived.

CROSS

1"	
1	Q Who was present on the occasion of those
2	conversations?
3	A The interpreters.
4	Q Can you give us their names?
5	A The name was NAKAJIMA.
6	Q Is that the only name you remember? You said
7	the interpreters were present.
8	A The other interpreter who was who came from
9	the Japanese Army headquarters, whose name I don't know
10	Q Can you tell
11	A (Continuing) Most of the time it was NAKAJIMA
12	who did the interpretation. If NAKAJIMA was sick, the
13	other interpreter came along to take his place.
14	Q Are you able to tell us, without reference to
15	your notes, approximately how long General UMEZU was in
16	Manchuria?
17	A Comparatively speaking, he stayed in Manchuria
18	rather long for a long time.
19	Q When was the National Foundation Shrine es-
20	tablished in Hsinking?
21	THE PRESIDENT: That surely is a memory test.
22	We will recess now for fifteen minutes.
23	(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was
24	taken until 1100, after which the proceed-
25	ings were resumed as follows:)

Goldberg & Yelde

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution respectfully requests permission from the Tribunal to have processed immediately exhibit 278, the letter purported to have been written by this witness and which the prosecution alleges is a fraud and a forgery so that it can -- which the prosecution may desire to introduce as proof of its own case against the defendant conspirators before this witness leaves. Up to this time the Tribunal, as I understand it, has left open the question as to whether or not the defense will be required to inform the Court as to the source of this document, from whence it came to their hands.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, although the document is not in evidence, there is no reason why it should not be dealt with in the manner you suggested.

Yesterday we gave permission for the prosecution, and we also intended the defense to have the liberty to take a translation of it. There was a suggestion that the defense already made a translation, but it was not clear. We understand now, Mr. Chief Prosecutor, you want to treat it as though it were an exhibit.

MR. KEENAN: Yes, Mr. President, we do, and

we would like to have the Court, if it is proper in accordance with the Court's judgment, to direct the defense to disclose where that document came from.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: In view of the repeated references to fraud and forgery, I think the defense should state that we naturally propose at the appropriate time, when, under the order of the Tribunal the document can be introduced as an exhibit, to disclose its provenance, its custody, its origin, and so far as within our power lies, to prove its authenticity.

of course, it is against public policy to compal the police to disclose the sources of their information. Maybe that would apply to the prosecution here and also to the defense; but if the genuineness of the document is attacked, you will necessarily have to disclose all those matters.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: As a part of our own case.

THE PRESIDENT: As you undertake to do.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: Yes, sir.

MR. KEENAN: If the Tribunal please, if it may be permitted, we do not know whether the defense will offer this or not, but it is a valuable piece of evidence in our opinion when it is translated and

, 25

analyzed as proof of the conspiracy in this case.

It comes into this courtroom and we believe we have a right to use it as part of the prosecution's case.

It is voluntarily offered. It is not requiring evidence of incrimination from defendants. They have offered it and opened the door, and we want to use it as a part of our case not resting upon the decision of the defense.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: It was the specific direction of the Tribunal that if the witness denied the authenticity of the document, it should not be offered in evidence. It has therefore not been offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, although the witness denied that the letter was his, you still have the right to prove it as his letter. That is one exception to the proof of collateral matters in English and American law, I believe. Now, if you don't prove it, if the defense don't prove it, the reaction on the Court must, perhaps, be most unfavorable.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: I have stated repeatedly that we do propose to make such proof, but I know of no way we can do it during the progress of the prosecution's case. On the other hand--

THE PRESIDENT: There is a way. The

S

prosecution can agree --

MR. KEENAN: Right.

THE PRESIDENT: (C

THE PRESIDENT: (Continuing) to the letter, or the alleged letter, being treated as evidence.

What shall be treated as evidence is largely a matter of agreement between the parties. If you agree to it being now treated as an exhibit and no longer as a document for identification, there is no reason why the processing should not go ahead.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution agrees to it.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it will be treated as evidence if both parties are agreed -- if all parties are agreed. You speak for only one defendant, of course, Major Blakeney. It can be treated as evidence against your client only.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, we are now in the stage of the prosecution offering its evidence and it is respectfully our contention that we have the right to offer any piece of evidence that is probative as part of the prosecution. We found out--

THE PRESIDENT: The procedure is simple,
Mr. Chief Prosecutor. Get the Court's permission to
take the exhibit for identification from the file,
then tender it with the consent of so many of the

•

accused as agree to its being evidence, and then it is in evidence as the prosecution's evidence.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, there is surely some confusion, respectfully, upon that point. If we have relevant evidence, however it comes before this Court, we certainly do not require the consent of all of the defendants before we can have relevant evidence put into this case. That is our privilege. It doesn't belong to the defense. We have the right to offer any evidence that is relevant, and we claim that this is relevant as a fraudulent document, part of this conspiracy.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief Prosecutor, you tender that document. It will not be objected to by Major Blakeney, but before I will express an opinion, I will hear any objection from the other accused. Tender the document. If nobody objects, it goes into evidence. If there is an objection, we hear it.

MR. KEENAN: I am now tendering it, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Apparently there is no objection.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: As counsel for the defendant MINAMI, I wish to be permitted to say a few words.

The document in question now is said to be a letter addressed from the witness to General MINAMI and as the date used on this letter employed the lunar calendar, there may be some confusion on this point; but when changed into the new calendar, the date reads the first of November, 1931. Therefore, judging from the date, this was written when the witness was still in Tientsin. But as the Manchurian Incident broke out on September 18, we may judge that this letter was written after the Manchurian Incident and before the witness left Tientsin.

question of how this document came into the hands of General MINAMI, as is written in the document itself a certain TOYAMA, tutor to the witness, took this document to Tokyo and placed it in General MINAMI's hands. Therefore, as the defense will prove in future, this document, having been sent to General MINAMI in his official capacity as War Minister, must be considered as a kind of public document. Therefore, from the first the defense had to pay careful attention to the question of submitting this document as evidence. We had to consider the problem as has arisen at the present moment of authenticity. Concerning this question of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

authenticity, we consider the fact that in 1934 Cheng-Hsiaohsu when he came to Tokyo endorsed the document as having been unmistakably penned by the witness. Furthermore, in view of the fact that this witness was formerly an Emperor of the Ching Dynasty and later became Emperor of Manchukuo, the defendant MINAMI could not bear trying to prove that the witness' testimony was false; but because of these various factors, the submission of this document has been delayed up to the present moment. But in view of the recent proceedings the defense has no objection to the presentation of this document as evidence. When I said "defense" -when my word was interpreted "defense," I was speaking only for the personal opinion of General MINAMI himself.

One other point. Our researches on this question, on the question of this document, have not yet been completed; but in view of the turn things have taken, we are forced to present it -- this document -- at the present moment. May I have the understanding of the Court regarding this point?

22 23

24

CROSS

M 1 0 r 2

3

4

A 5 b r 6

33

7

10

9

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

23

24 25 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, on behalf of the defendant SUZUKI and on behalf of the defendant MUTO, being authorized to express the views of his counsel, Mr. Roger Cole, we object to the introduction of this document in evidence. In this connection I should like to state, in response to the argument of the Chief Prosecutor, that it is not a question as to whether or not the Chief Prosecutor is offering the evidence, but it is a question of whether or not all the defense will consent thereto. I think that the Chief Prosecutor probably misapprehends the position of counsel for the defense. While he is covering the entire range of the trial, no individual counsel for the defense, unless specifically authorized, can spear for all of the defense counsel, either Japanese or American.

I believe, Mr. President, that it might be pertinent for me to state at this time for the benefit of the Court something about the organization of the defense counsel, which would take only a moment.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal said before you spoke that all the defendants had a right to be consulted about this point -- about this evidence.

We are clear on that, Mr. Levin. We said, ourselves, that Major Blakeney did not speak for all of the defense, 3 all of the accused. So the organization of defense counsel need hardly be referred to. In Australia -- I can only speak for my own country -- and, I think, in most British countries, that letter could not be tendered for this simple reason: the witness denied that that was his letter; the letter was rightfully in the possession of the defense; there is no power to compel the defense to disclose anything. But, following the procedure we adopted here, we asked that the letter be put in for identification. It is now in the custody of the Court. The prosecution cannot use it without the permission of the Court. The Court may give that permission, and I express no opinion one way or the other about the propriety of that.

There is another question. The letter purports to be a communication from the witness to MINAMI. At least I understand it is -- it does. question arises whether this communication as between two persons, as between one defendant and the witness, is to be treated as evidence against all. Recently we reserved for consideration the question of whether a confession by one accused should be evidence

20 21

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

against all. It may be that the Court will decide to receive the evidence subject to each accused being connected with the letter.

I don't know that we have heard all the defense has to say, but it would look to me to be a question upon which we should reserve our decision.

MR. LEVIN: If I may add one word, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and, I believe, a number of my associates, we are very glad to have the expression of the Court with reference to its understanding as to the statements of individual counsel as to their application.

THE PRESIDENT: I used the expression "there is no disclosure against defendants." I should have used the expression, "there is no discovery against defendants in a criminal trial." The Court will consider the matter.

Major Blakeney. BY MAJOR BLAKENEY (Continued):

I was inquiring about the establishment of the National Foundation Shrine in Hsinking. Is it or is it not a fact that the idea of establishing this shrine was proposed by you voluntarily upon your return from Tokyo?

There is no such a thing as voluntary.

23.

Everything was in the hands of the Kwantung Army.

Everything, every official act, were decided by the Kwantung Army as well as the General Affairs Bureau and they have asked the Manchukuo State to carry out. This I have already explained to you.

Prior to my departure, prior to my next visit, second visit, to Tokyo, the then General UEDA talked to me in regard to the establishment of this National Foundation Shrine. General UEDA was then transferred back to Japan because he was defeated at Nomonhan. It was then he told me, that he was discussing with me the establishment of this National Foundation Shrine. He expressed the fervent desire that Manchukuo should have the same kind of religion as Japan has. I then replied that we Chinese have our own Chinese religion and we didn't need any foreign religion. There was then no point of this discussion, so it was laid off. It was then after UMEZU arrived in Manchuria and took up his post that Shintoism was put into force, into effect.

CHINESE MONITOR: Rather, the practice of Shintoism was put into effect.

A (Continuing) Prior to the practice being put into effect, there was a meeting among the Japanese lower staff, lower military officers, held at the

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

then Officers' Guild. Among the attendants there was the Fourth Section Chief of the Manchukuo State --Fourth Section Chief of the Japanese Kwantung Army. It was also attended by the staff of the General Affairs Bureau of the Manchukuo State. At the meeting, the director of the Fourth Section of the Kwantung Army announced that there was present Chinese as well as Manchurians and Japanese. It was also announced by this section director that it is the decision of the Japanese Government that from now on the so-called Amaterasu Omikami should be imparted into Manchuria and should be sacrificed to by the Chinese. Among the Chinese officials then present were one Mr. Ku-Tsuhung. He was then working in the General Affairs Bureau and then transferred to the Ministry of Communications. This Chinese official, that is, Ku-Tsuhung, then expressed objection to the proposition made by the then director of the Fourth Section, named KATAKURA. After a lengthy discussion, the director of the Fourth Section said that this is being a fixed policy of the Japanese Government and that you Chinese officials under the Manchukuo State are not allowed to debate on this issue and not allowed to offer any opinion.

Q Were you present at that meeting?

A No.

How do you know what took place? This gentleman named Ku-Tsuhung reported the 3 matter to the chairman of the Privy Council who, in 4 turn, reported to me. Give us the name of the chairman of the Privy 6 Council. His name Tsang-Shihyi; his name is Tsang-A 8 Shihyi. Can you give us the names of any other Japanese 10 who were present at that meeting? I am only relating to you what was reported 12 to me by the Privy Council Chairman and I, of course, 13 cannot give you the different names of the Japanese 14 vice ministers then present. The then Director of the 15 General Affairs Bureau was HOSHINO, the defendant in 16 the dock. He, together with some other Japanese high 17 officials, then reprimanded very bitterly this Chinese 18 official Ku-Tsuhung and said that we Chinese should 19 never have tried to object to this kind of arrangement, 20 to this kind of fixed Japanese policy. THE PRESIDENT: I read again this letter from 21 22 the witness to MINAMI. Of course, that is admitted as 23 against Major Blakeney's client and prosecution can 24 attempt to establish, if it can, that it is not authentic. We will recess now until half past one. 25

```
(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was
 1 4 2
         taken.)
 3
 4
 5
 6
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1345.

D
u
d
a
&
W
h
a
1
е
n

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

HENRY PU-YI, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

BY MAJOR BLAKENEY (Continued):

CHINESE INTERPRETER: Prior to the recess the witness was saying Lieutenant General YOSHIOKA came -- directly approached me.

Q Had you finished your statement in that matter?

A I will continue. And said that now it is the decided policy of the Japanese Government that Manchuria shall worship the Amaterasu Omikami. He said further that he has come to see me on the order of General UMEZU, and General UMEZU ordered me to go to Japan to fetch the Amaterasu Omikami myself. And he also told me to make a gesture to the public that I am going to Japan at my own free will. I was then feeling very bad, and I always considered that is the worst humiliation that I had ever experienced.

24

25

A

As far as I myself was concerned, I objected to this vigorously. But under the compulsion of the Japanese 2 Kwantung Army I had to go. 3 Yes. Now, I want to ask you about another 4 matter. You have mentioned Sir Reginald F. Johnston a 5 time or two. I should like you to tell us just what 6 his position in your household was. He was my English tutor. 8 Q Did he serve you for a good many years? 9 Yes. 10 In addition to being your tutor, was he also 11 your friend and adviser? 12 He was merely a tutor of mine. 13 Was he quite familiar with all the details of 14 your life and your opinions during the period he was 15 with you? 16 What time do you refer to? 17 I said during the time he was with you. 18 For ordinary times, of course, he knew a little 19 20 bit of me. But after I went to Manchuria he didn't know anything about me. 21 I believe you said that in his book about 22

"Twilight in the Forbidden City," he correctly stated

In that book there were many sections. In

the circumstances of that part of your life?

the section describing my life in the Forbidden City in Peiping, that section in which he described my miserable life in the Forbidden City, that was correct.

Q What about the part in which he described your life in Tientsin? Is that correct, too?

A I had never the occasion of reading through the whole book. But Mr. Johnston had explained to me what he was writing about. I agree with him in regard to that section in which he described my life in the Forbidden City. As far as that section describing my life in Tientsin, I didn't know what he was writing about. When we were in Peking, we were living together, but in Tientsin we were living apart.

Q When was the last time you saw Sir Reginald Johnston?

- A The last time I saw him was in Manchuria.
- Q When was that?
 - A I cannot recall the date or the year.
- Q When was the last time you saw him before leaving Tientsin?

A To tell you frankly, I cannot recall these dates. Since I cannot recall, I cannot tell you.

G	1	Q Did you see him within about a month before
e	2	the time you left Tientsin for Port Arthur?
e n	3	A I cannot recall.
b	4	Q Did you write a preface to Sir Reginald
r	5	Johnston's book?
&	6	A I cannot recall that.
В	7	Q I ask you whether you can recall that you
a t	8	did write such a preface and that in that preface
t	9	you stated as follows:
n	10	MR. KEENAN: Object to the same question
	11	being asked twice. The witness has already answered
	12	he didn't remember. He repeats the question again
	13	united with another one. I object to it; and it
	14	has nothing whatever to do with anything this wit-
	15	ness said in the examination in chief.
	16	MAJOR BLAKENEY: I am attempting to refresh
	17	the witness' recollection.
	18	THE PRESIDENT: I think you ought to bear
	19	the pursuit a little further, Major.
	20	Q I quote: "In the second month of the Ich'ou
	21	year, I made another move and went to reside in
	22	Tientsin."
	23	LANGUAGE SECTION CHIEF: Major Blakeney,
	24	how do you spell Ich ou?

MAJOR BLAKENEY: I-c-h-!-o-u.

THE PRESIDENT: I take this to be an attempt 1 by you to prove a past statement of the witness 2 inconsistent with his present testimony. 3 MAJOR BLAKENEY: Yes, sir. I propose to 4 show by the remainder of the quotation that the 5 witness has stated that no one had a more intimate 6 knowledge than Johnston of the events herein related. 7 I then propose to confront the witness with some of 8 9 Johnston's relations with the events to which he has 10 testified in chief. 11 THE PRESIDENT: You are at liberty to tell 12 him who made the statement, where it was made, and 13 when. 14 MAJOR BLAKENEY: Yes, sir. I have already 15 stated to him that I am reading what purports to be 16 his preface to this book. I will be glad to furnish 17 the date, too. 18 THE PRESIDENT: As it is in English, it is 19 useless; I take it, to hand him the book. 20 MAJOR BLAKENEY: It is in both English and 21 Chineses 22 THE PRESIDENT: Why not show him the Chinese? 23 (Whereupon, the book above referred

to was handed to the witness.)

25

4

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

identification.

BY MAJOR BLAKENEY (Continued): Q I show you what purports to be a preface as written by you to Sir Reginald F. Johnston's book and ask you whether you wrote it. This was written by Cheng Hsiao-hsu. It looks like it was by Cheng Hsiao-hsu. It was not written by me. Do you mean that the calligraphy is not by you or that the words are not yours? I have never seen this. I believe that it was written by Cheng Hsiao-hsu. THE PRESIDENT: Well, you have a denial. You can prove it by calling Johnston if he is available. The same conditions apply to him as apply to others. You will tender the preface to be marked for identification, Major? MAJOR BLAKENEY: Yes, sir, and I can assure the Tribunal that Sir Reginald F. Johnston has met his untimely end. THE PRESIDENT: That is the end of that phase.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked number 279 for

(Whereupon, the preface to the

book "Twilight in the Forbidden City" was marked defense's exhibit No. 279 for identification.)

MAJOR BLAKENEY: That is the preface, as I understand it.

THE PRESIDENT: The preface only is marked because you have not referred to the book.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: Yes, sir, not yet.

May I read the preface into the record?

THE PRESIDENT: It is not in evidence.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: I tender it in evidence.

MR. KEENAN: I object.

THE PRESIDENT: We will hear you on that, Mr. Keenan.

MR. KEENAN: The defense offers a printed document in a book without in any manner proving that it was either written, signed or ever previously reviewed by this witness. It could be edmissible on the theory of affecting the credibility of the witness. But, since he denies that he wrote it or that he had previous knowledge of it, and, obviously, since the author of the book is, as I understand, deceased and there is no intent to offer him, prosecution contends that for impeachment purposes the proper foundation has not been laid.

If it is offered for the purpose of proving the facts, it is more unsoundly based as a matter of evidence, because it has no authenticity at this time for it whatsoever. Since, then, there is no showing whatsoever making this witness responsible for these remarks, it would seem to go well beyond the limits of any evidence offered in the case for purposes of impeachment without any such basis of

authenticity in relation to this witness.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: I propose, of course, in a moment to offer the entire book, including the statement of the author of the book relative to the origin and provenance. Certainly, at this stage of the proceedings, it comes with ill grace from the prosecution to object to the reception of hearsay evidence. I should like to ask the witness additional questions relative to this preface; but, as I understand, I am precluded from doing so by the statement of the Tribunal that the matter is closed.

THE PRESIDENT: Of course, this would not be evidence in any national court. The witness having denied the authorship of the preface excludes it as evidence until it is established by the defense.

Well, you could establish it only by calling

1 2

the author of the book. He is dead. The best evidence then is the book itself. But, that would not be evidence in any national court except in the case of some recognized authority. Johnston is not a recognized authority as far as I am aware.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: We will have no difficulty in proving Sir Reginald Johnston's standing, sir.

There is, in fact --

THE PRESIDENT: This book would be excluded in Germany. This very point has arisen there. But, as I said before, we are eleven nations; and, I think, on this matter of acting on what appears in books, I shall have to take the opinion of the whole Court. It already has arisen in the case of Wood-head's book. We will consider the matter.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: Am I then, sir, at liberty to put to the witness quotations from the body of the book at this time?

THE PRESIDENT: You could do that only on the assumption that you could use the book as evidence later, and you are not in the position to make that assumption.

Proceed with your cross-examination on other points, Major, and we may be able to give you a decision after the next adjournment.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: This being my last point,
I will, by leave of the Tribunal, suspend my crossexamination pending the ruling. I have nothing
further.

THE PRESIDENT: We give you leave to resume your cross-examination later, if necessary, Major.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, might I be permitted to say, for whatever value it may have, the suggestion of the prosecution that we have no objection to this book or any part of it going in evidence as reflecting the views of the author, for whatever weight it may have. But, we do object to impeaching a witness, if it is for that sole purpose, by purporting to bind him by a statement which, not alone is not authenticated, but which he denied that he ever wrote or authorized. That is our position.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: I must submit to the Tribunal that that is not the point in issue. I have
already passed from the preface and have suggested
that my desire now is to put to the witness statements of the author of the book relating to conversations with the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Without the consent of the prosecution, you cannot do that yet.

1-	
1	Captain Kleiman.
2	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Your Honor, the follow-
3	ing question is not a memory question.
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)
5	BY CAPTAIN KLEIMAN:
6	Q Mr. Pu-Yi, do you remember what month
7	or in what season you visited Japan in the year
8	1940? You may use your notes on this if you wish,
9	Mr. Pu-Yi.
10	A I forgot all about it. About these notes
11	I was asked to produce in the morning, I didn't
12	have enough time to locate it until now lunch
13	hour.
14	Q I mean, you can use any notes you have with
15	you now.
16	A I couldn't find that note yet. The interp-
17	retation is wrong. During the lunch hour, as I was
18	rather busy, I didn't have enough time to locate it.
19	Q Well, did you visit Japan in the year 1940?
20	A Yes.
21	Q And did you not visit Japan during the
22	springtime of the year 1940?
23	A You can refresh your memory by reading the
24	Year Book. All these dates are in the Year Book.

Q Well, may I refresh your memory by advising

you I read the Year Book, and I found that date.
Would that help you, that you visited Japan in the springtime of the year 1940?

A Well, if it was written in the Year Book like that, it must be true.

Q Do you remember in what year you had visited Japan before the 1940 visit? You can use your notes on this if you wish, Pu-Yi.

A That was the time when the accused MINAMI was the Commanding General of the Japanese Kwantung Army.

Q In what year or years was that?

A If you will read -- you please look into the Year Book. You don't have to ask me all these questions; you simply waste my time.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you are not testing his memory; you don't require the information.

What is your point?

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: No, your Honor, I didn't wish to test memory; I just wished to have the date established. I am leaving that point right now.

olf & Spratt	1	Q Mr. Pu-Yi, you testified that, at the time
	2	Japan entered the Japanese-German Pact, a Japanese
	3	Imperial Rescript was issued concerning the eight
	4	corners of the world. What pact are you referring to?
	5	A Then I referred to the Germany-Italy-Japan
	6	Alliance Pact.
	7	Q Do you know what year that Pact was signed?
	В	A I don't think it advisable to waste any more
	9	time on this. I can tell you the frank truth: I cannot
	10	recall this.
	11	Q Well, do you know whether the Tri-Partite
	12	Alliance Pact that you are referring to
	13	A Yes.
	14	Q And have you read that Pact?
	15	A I only learned of this from my friend,
	16	Tsan-Shihyi.
	17	Q Had you read the Imperial Rescript that you
	18	testified about?
	19	A I have never read the original text of the
	20	rescript. I only learned of it from him.
	21	Q You mean that you never read any copy of that
	22	rescript; is that right?
	23	A As I said, I have never read the original
	24	text. I learned of the existence of this rescript
	25	from Mr. Tsan-Shihyi.

A

Ç	Is that	the only	person	from whom	you heard
the term	, "eight	corners o	f the w	orld"?	
A	Not only	from him	alone;	I also le	earned it
from Lie	utenant Ge	eneral Yo	SHIOKA.		
Q	In the la	ast eight	months	has anybo	ody spoken
to you al	bout eight	corners	of the	world?	

Q By the way, do you speak English, speak and understand English, Mr. Pu-Yi?

No, not at all.

A Well, I used to be rather proficient in English. In the past ten or more years I didn't even have any chance of reading foreign books nor speaking foreign languages; so now I cannot understand -- I cannot speak, but I can understand a little bit. There was once when I attempted to order some English textbooks, with which I was thinking of reviewing this course. General YOSHIOKA refused me.

Q Did you not understand English questions that were put to you before they were translated into Chinese in this courtroom?

A Some of them I understand, and some, not.

Q You testified that you were told to sign the Japanese-Manchurian Treaty. What treaty did you refer to?

THE PRESIDENT: He said the Japanese-

13

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

16

18

20 21

22

23

24

Manchurian Treaty. I do not know what more you want. 1 If you want any more, you had better suggest what it 2 3 is. 4 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: That is what I am trying 5 to find out about, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: What help will it be? 7 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: It will help some of us 8 to find out whether we are concerned or not, depend-9 ing upon the year of the treaty and the treaty that

A I have not finished my answer to the last question yet,

Q Please finish your answer.

A Lieutenant General YOSHIOKA further elaborated that this phrase, "eight corners under one roof," includes all people the world over, and said that the people the world over were all the descendents of the Amaterasu Omikami.

Q Mr. Pu-Yi, will you please advise me as to what treaty you refer to when you said that you were told to sign that Japanese-Manchukuon Treaty?

A All these documents I signed, ever since the Japanese went into Manchuria, until the Japanese surrender, were under compulsion -- were signed under compulsion.

12

10

11

was signed.

14

13

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceed-ings were resumed as follows:)

Goldberg & Yelden

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kleiman.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Yes, your Honor.

BY CAPTAIN . KLEIMAN (Continued):

O I am referring to the treaty that you testified to two days ago. If you do not remember the date, do you remember any of the terms of that particular treaty?

A That treaty was signed between General MUTO and Cheng-Hsiaohsu. That is the name of that treaty is Japan-Manchukuo Agreement. The day previous to signing this agreement we didn't know anything about it. When General MUTO came to see us, he brought over that agreement.

Q Did you not personally know the provisions of some of the terms of that treaty long before that one day that you just made mention of?

A I only know of it when they brought over.

Q And you -- and is your answer that you never discussed any of the provisions of that treaty with any Japanese person before that particular day?

A As far as I recollect, I knew of all these terms only at the time when they brought them and showed them to me.

Q You testified that six million people migrated to Manchuria squeezing the Manchurians out. Now the Lytton Report says that there were about two hundred and thirty thousand Japanese in Manchuria. Would that tend to refresh your recollection concerning the number of Japanese in Manchuria?

A What I referred to, the figure of six million, was I meant to say that they had a plan to remove six million Japanese immigrants over. The Japanese were immigrating into Manchuria from time to time in continual -- continuously. As to the exact number of these immigrants, I couldn't tell.

Q You testified that the Japanese plan was to make China bankrupt. Did you also mean thereby that they intended to make Manchuria bankrupt?

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt able counsel for the defense, but I am constrained to say that the statement contains a matter that I believe is not in the record. I believe the purport of the testimony was, the substance of it, that it ended in bankruptcy. I do not remember that this witness said that there was any plan to bankrupt Manchuria.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: In answer to that may I

.

read the record? 1 THE PRESIDENT: One does not pretend to 2 recall every word said in evidence, but I don't 3 recollect there was any suggestion of an attempt to 4 make China bankrupt. 5 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May I read from the record, 6 may it please the Tribunal? 7 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 8 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Page 4022, Line 7. "In 9 other words, this planning of theirs was to make 10 China bankrupt **". 11 THE PRESIDENT: Better read the whole question 12 or answer. 13 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Question on Line 3. "Were 14 these companies of small capital or medium or very 15 large sums of capital?" "Answer: The capitalization of these companies were all in huge amounts, sometimes 17 running into billions. In other words, this planning 18 of theirs was to make China bankrupt and also to 19 expand their influences outward." 20 THE PRESIDENT: Well, the record supports 21 22 you, and the objection is overruled. A (No answer.) 23 24 Q As a matter of fact, Mr. Witness, did not both China and Manchuria benefit economically as a

result of Japanese activity in Manchuria?

A All those Japanese activities were selfish activities.

Q Selfish or not, did not China and the Manchurian people benefit economically as a result of the Japanese activity in Manchuria?

A Well, at that time everything was controlled, and all these control laws were made by HOSHINO, and all these commodities were controlled. Consequently the Chinese were made bankrupt. If you had been in Manchuria, you could have seen all these things on the spot.

Q The Lytton Report says that before Japanese activity in Manchuria, its lands and industries were undeveloped. Is that a correct statement of fact?

A You have to notice the difference of time.

Do you know when this Lord Lytton Commission go to

Manchuria, and do you know when the Japanese started
exploiting the Manchurian people in Manchuria?

If China had -- if Manchurian people had exploited
their own industrial resources, that would have
been to the benefit of their own people. But Japan
was exploiting the industrial resources purely for
the benefit of the Japanese people themselves.

Q	Is it a fact, Mr. Witness, that under the
Japanese	guidance after the establishment of your
Manchuku	o Government agricultural products were
doubled	within a few years?
A	It all depends who got all these benefits.
Q	Will you please answer my question, Mr.
Witness?	Will you please repeat the question?
	(Whereupon, the last question was

not to the Manchurians.

read by the official court reporter.)

A Yes, there might have been some increase,
but the profit and benefit all went to the Japanese,

Q Is it not a fact that before Japanese activity in Manchuria after the year 1905 Manchurian lands were practically a fertile region?

A At that time Manchuria was a vast territory and is resourceful, and the population then was not big. At that time the Chinese were tilling the land themselves and they were self-supporting. It was very different from the latter situation when everyone was being robbed by the Japanese. As I have already testified, the Japanese immigrants kicked out the Chinese natives and grabbed all this tilled land and then make these Chinese natives go on to farther off places, and they considered that

& 'M'

as a kind of exploration, consequently the Japanese were occupying all this tilled land and the Chinese were occupying this undeveloped land. Of course, in some cases, the Chinese were paid nominally -- were promised to be paid nominally, and in some cases they were never paid at all, so inside of Manchukuo -- Manchuria -- Chinese were made bankrupt and outwardly and Japan was evidencing an aggressive attitude.

Q Mr. Witness, was it not Japanese activity in Manchuria that attracted so many Chinese farmers, laborers, and industrialists, that the number of Japanese compared with them was practically nothing?

A Well, if the Japanese had succeeded in realizing their plan to have six million Japanese immigrated into Manchuria within twenty years time, that number would not be small. Even before the completion of this plan the Chinese were already made bankrupt. If that plan were made realized I could never imagine what state the Chinese would be in.

Q Mr. Witness, the Lytton Report states that under the Manchurian warlords more than two hundred million dollars were spent on large armies; that people were heavily taxed; that eighty per cent of the taxes were used for the upkeep of the army. Does

22

23

24

25

that refresh your recollection about conditions in 1 Manchuria before Japanese activity? 2 That concerns with the internal affairs 3 of China only. It was different when Manchuria was 4 being occupied by the Japanese. Don't you admit that 5 during the Japanese occupation of Manchuria the 6 people were in a state of -- were suffering very much? No, I don't admit that Mr. Witness. I 8 think the Manchuria people were suffering --9 THE PRESIDENT: Enough of that. 10 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: I am sorry, your Honor. 11 THE PRESIDENT: Your interrogation has been 12 developing into an argument for some time. That is 13 the result of putting large passages from the Lytton 14 15 Report to him. It doesn't profit you. 16 Mr. Witness, the Lytton report states that 17 under --18 THE PRESIDENT: Well --19 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: A very short statement, 20

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: A very short statement, if it please your Honor, to see if that would either tend to refresh the recollection of this witness, or to make him change his answer.

THE PRESIDENT: We expect counsel to exercise a little common sense in these matters. You have very little hope of getting anything out of him by

putting to him passages from the Lytton Report.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, your Honor.

Q Is it not a fact, Mr. Witness, that under the Manchurian warlords people were heavily taxed?

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I object to that question on two grounds: First, that it is without the scope of the examination in chief, it was not testified to one way or the other by this witness and therefore is excluded under the Court's ruling. Secondly, whether or not the Manchurians were heavily, nedium or lightly taxed was none of the business of the Japanese nation or warlords and could have offered no plausible defense for them coming into Manchuria.

dent, I think the answer of this witness that the Japanese plan was to make China bankrupt is almost broad enough to admit anything, and the fact that the people were heavily taxed to keep up an army, and another question which I was asking merely is a preliminary question to another question that I am going to ask, and that is that after the establishment of the Manchukuoan Government the officials paid so much money monthly to the Chine.se Nationalist Government.

. 13

border in the year 1929.

THE PRESIDENT: It must be obvious to you
that the rules of the Court are not controlled by
a witness' answers. The objection is sustained.
CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right.
Q Mr. Witness, you testified that the Soviet
Government had no aggressive policy against Man-
churia. Would you include in that statement also
China?
A I am not quite clear about the question.
THE MONITOR: Will you read back the
question?
(Whereupon, the last question was
read by the official court reporter.)
A This, I don't know. I cannot answer any-
thing which I do not know.
Q But you still insist that the Soviet Govern-
ment had no aggressive policy against Manchuria?
THE PRESIDENT: He has already answered.
Q Is this not a fact, Mr. Witness, that
Soviet troop raids across the Manchurian border in
the year 1929 developed into a military invasion?
A Which particular place do you refer to?
Q Any particular place on the Manchurian

This was purely Japanese propaganda for their

own consumption.

Q If the Lytton Report made a statement of that sort, would you consider that Japanese propaganda?

MR. KEENAN: May the witness be permitted to complete his answer to the previous question?

THE PRESIDENT: The witness may add to his answer.

A At the time when the Chang Ku-feng Incident broke out the Japanese Army Commander was General MEDA. At that time the Japanese Army was completely defeated. It was their intention at first that they wanted to test the strength of Russia.

THE PRESIDENT: Before the Court adjourns

I have two decisions of the Tribunal to announce.

The first relates to exhibit 278, the letter purporting to be from the witness to the accused MINAMI.

That will be evidence not merely against Major

Blakeney's client, but against all the other accused who are connected with it or linked with it, according to the proof that may be established by the prosecution.

The second point is as to the effect of Mr. Johnston's book. Statements in that book attributed to the witness may be put to him for the time being. We don't now know how many statements in that book

are attributed to him. If a large part of the book is involved we may have to consider some other method of dealing with the situation.

We will adjourn now until half past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Friday, 23 August 1946, at 0930.)